REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1-19 were pending prior to the Office Action. Claims 5-7 and 11-18 have been cancelled through this Reply. Thus, claims 1-4, 8-10, and 19 are currently pending of which claim 1 is independent. Claims 1, 3, and 8-10 have been amended through this Reply. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seek timely allowance of all pending claims.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Specification is objected to for minor informalities. *See Office Action, item 1.* The Specification has been amended to address this objection. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTION – Momber

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Momber (U.S. Patent No. 7,259,479)[hereinafter "Momber"]. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 5-7, 11, and 13 have been cancelled through this Reply rendering the rejection of these claims as moot.

For a Section 102 rejection to be proper, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every claimed element. *See M.P.E.P. 2131; M.P.E.P. 706.02.* Thus, if the cited reference fails to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this instance, Momber fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed element. For example, amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "***a third capacitor***, one end of which is connected between said first capacitor and said first diode ***on said first electric connection line***, and the other end of which is connected to said second input connection." *Emphasis added.*

Support for this amendment can be found on Figs. 9 and 16 of the instant application. This third capacitor provides further improves the efficiency of the power converter when pulsations are generated.

It is respectfully submitted that Momber fails to teach or suggest the above-identified claim feature.

Momber merely discloses a conventional transformerless power supply device which provides either a dual positive or dual negative DC voltage supply. In order to achieve this objective, Momber discloses that a positive half-cycle for an ac input signal is applied to a wave rectifier (20, 22), a filter (41) and a voltage regulator (30, 31) for generating a DC output signal. The AC input signal is also applied to a transistor (50) in either the common emitter or common source configuration which shifts the ac input signal by 180 degrees. This signal is then applied to another rectifier (21, 23) for converting the shifted AC input signal into a pulsating DC output signal. Then shifted DC output signal is applied to a second capacitor filter to reduce the signal variations. The final stage for the second output stage is also a voltage regulator (32, 33) (i.e., two series zener diodes). (*See Abstract.*)

Momber is distinguished from the claimed invention in that nowhere does Momber teach or suggest "***a third capacitor***, one end of which is connected between said first capacitor and said first diode ***on said first electric connection line***, and the other end of which is connected to said second input connection" as recited in amended claim 1.

In Fig. 7, Momber merely illustrates the operation of a conventional half-wave voltage doubler consisting of a first (126) and second (127) diodes and a first (143) and second (144) capacitors. For example, Momber discloses that during negative alterations of an AC input, the first diode (126) is reversed biased and the second diode is forward biased by the AC input signal polarity. The first capacitor (143) is charged until its plate-to-plate voltage reaches the value of a source voltage wherein the second capacitor (144) is discharged through a load resistance.

Further, with respect to Fig. 7 of Momber, the Examiner indicated the existence of a first capacitor (143), a second capacitor (144), a first diode (126) and a second diode (127), and further indicated the existence of a capacitor (146) of Fig. 8 with respect to the third capacitor.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the connection relationship of the third capacitor (146) is totally different than the connection relationship of the claimed third capacitor.

In Momber, to find out the connecting relations between the third capacitor and the first and the second capacitor, and the first and the second diode, it is necessary to find an element corresponding to the indicated capacitors (143, 144) and diodes (126, 127) in Fig. 8. From the similarity of the connecting relations, in Fig. 8, existences of a first capacitor (147), a second capacitor (145), a first diode (128) and a second diode (129) may be indicated. If so, however, a diode 129 should be inserted in a second electric connection line, and therefore, ***a capacitor 146*** should ***be connected*** between the first capacitor and the first diode ***on a second electric connection line***. (Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that Momber cannot anticipate the claimed ***third capacitor***, one end of which is connected between the first capacitor and the first diode ***on the first electric connection line***, and the other end of which is connected to the second input connection.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is distinguishable from Momber. Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 1 ***and further in view of novel features recited therein***, claims 2-3 are also distinguishable from Momber.

For example, claim 3 recites, *inter alia*, "a resistor interposed along said first electric connection line delimited by a point of connection at said first and second electric connection line and the first input connection." A resistor in this amendment produces an effect of suppressing rush current flow, and described in the instant application as a thermistor TH (Fig. 1) or a resistor R (Figs. 9 and 16). It is respectfully submitted that Momber fails to teach or suggest the above-identified amended feature of claim 3.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, based on Momber, be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTION – Momber

Claims 4, 8-10, 12 and 14-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Momber. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 12 and 14-18 have been cancelled through this Reply rendering the rejection of these claims as moot.

Claims 4, 8-10, and 19 depend from depend from claim 1, directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 1, claims 4, 8-10, and 19 are also distinguishable from Momber.

Further, for a Section 103 rejection to be proper, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must be established. *See M.P.E.P. 2142.* One requirement to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness is that there must be a suggestion or motivation within the cited reference(s) to modify the reference(s) as proposed in the Office Action. See M.P.E.P. 2143.01. The claimed invention as a whole must be considered. It is not enough to determine whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. See M.P.E.P. 2141.02.

In this instance, the Examiner contends that utilizing a thermistor or the ratio of the capacitances to each other into the circuit of Momber is an obvious design modification. In essence the Examiner is arguing that the invention is merely design choice over Momber. The Examiner did not provide any suggestion or motivation within Momber of the above mentioned modification.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested to withdraw this obviousness rejection of claims 4, 8-10, and 19, based on Momber.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By #58,755

D. Richard Anderson
Registration No.: 40,439
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant